



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,334	03/07/2007	Rudi Mueller-Walz	28069-624N01US	5874
36623 7590 05/26/2010 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				
EXAMINER KENNEDY, NICOLETTA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1611				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/26/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,334

Applicant(s)

MUELLER-WALZ, RUDI

Examiner

Nicoletta Kennedy

Art Unit

1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/7/09 and 2/26/10

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1 and 3-33 are currently pending. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Priority

This application, filed March 31, 2006, is a national stage entry of PCT/IB04/03481, filed October 4, 2004 and claims foreign priority to United Kingdom application 0323684.1, filed October 9, 2003. Applicants have provided a certified copy of the United Kingdom application.

Withdrawn Objections/Rejections

1. The objection to claim 7 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.
2. The rejection of claims 1-2, 7-10, 13-16, 21, 23-25, 27-28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110) and Trofast (WO 01/89491) is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.
3. The rejection of claims 3-6, 17, 21-22, 26 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110), Trofast (WO 01/89491) and Kordikowski et al. (US 2003/0223939) is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.
4. The rejection of claims 11-12, 18-19 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110), Trofast (WO 01/89491) and Keller et al. (US 6,475,467) is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Maintained Rejections

5. The rejection of claim 20 under 25 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (US 2005/0152846) in view of Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) is maintained.

Davies et al. teach an inhalable pharmaceutical formulation comprising formoterol or one of its pharmaceutically acceptable salts such as fumarate (abstract, para. 30). Davies et al. additionally teach that the formulation comprises a liquefied HFA propellant and ethanol as a co-solvent (paras. 0057 and 0059). Additionally Davies et al. teach that the stability of the formulation is improved by having lower than 500 ppm of water based on the total weight of the formulation (paras. 0073 and 0112). MPEP 2144.05 states that "[i]n the case where the claimed ranges 'overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art' a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists" quoting *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). In the instant case, the claimed range overlaps the range disclosed by Davies et al. and is thus *prima facie* obvious.

However, Davies et al. do not teach that the formoterol fumarate is formoterol fumarate dihydrate. Clarke et al. cure this deficiency.

Clarke et al. teach an aerosol composition for a metered dose inhaler comprising formoterol fumarate dihydrate, ethanol, and HFA 134a (para. 0024).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Davies et al. with those of Clarke et al. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so with regard to

Clarke et al. teach a specific aerosol composition comprising formoterol fumarate dihydrate, a formoterol salt generally disclosed by Davies et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 26, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the combination of Davies and Clarke does not render claim 20 obvious because the combination fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success in making a suspension formulation of formoterol fumarate dihydrate having a moisture content of from 50 ppm to 800 ppm because Davies teaches that suspension formulations are less desirable than solution formulations.

Although Applicant is correct in characterizing the preferred use of formoterol fumarate is in solution, MPEP 2123 states that "[a] reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments" quoting *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). Davies explains that relevant aerosol formulations may be in the form of solutions or suspensions (para. 0010). As further acknowledged by Applicant, Davies teaches that solution formulations do not present stability problems and so could guaranty a higher dose of uniformity and reproducibility (para. 0010). However, Davies also cites several sources teaching aerosol inhaler suspension formulations (paras. 0039-0041). The water content is lowered to improve stability and therefore the general teachings of Davies teach that aerosol formulations, known to be in solution or suspension, have improved stability when water content is decreased, thus motivating one of ordinary skill in the art to lower

the water content to improve the stability of both solution and suspension formulations, as each suffer from stability problems. Clarke is merely cited to show a commonly used form of formoterol fumarate, the dihydrate form.

New Claim Rejections Necessitated by Amendment

Claim Objections

6. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim is identified as "currently amended" when in fact no amendment has been made.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 3-19 and 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims depend, directly or indirectly, from a cancelled claim (claim 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 1, 7-10, 13-16, 21, 23-25, 27-28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) read in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110) and Trofast (WO 01/89491).

Regarding claims 1, 7-8 and 28, Clarke et al. teach an aerosol composition for a metered dose inhaler comprising formoterol fumarate dihydrate, ethanol, and HFA 134a (para. 0024). Clarke et al. teach further teach that the aerosol composition for a metered dose inhaler is comprised of formoterol fumarate dihydrate and fluticasone propionate , a steroid (para. 0024). However, Clarke et al. fail to teach the water content of formoterol fumarate di-hydrate. Trofast et al. cure this deficiency.

Trofast et al. teach a process for providing water-soluble micronized substances wherein the residual water from the micronized substance is reduced by drying at an elevated temperature and/or in a vacuum (abstract). Trofast et al. explain that the invention relates to a process for providing water-soluble micronized substances which can be stored and used while maintaining the aerodynamic properties required for inhalation of such substances (p. 3, lines 5-14). The process may specifically be used on anti-asthmatic substances (claim 9).

Trofast teaches that formoterol fumarate dihydrate, when combined with a reactive species such as an aldehyde, is prone to degradation (p. 2 line 25 –p. 3, line 2). Trofast explains that when formoterol fumarate dihydrate is combined with lactose monohydrate, they form degradation products (p. 3, lines 11-16). Additionally, relative humidity influences the stability of the powder (p. 3, lines 19-20).

Although neither Clarke et al., Trofast et al., or Trofast teach the specific water content of formoterol fumarate dihydrate, MPEP 2144.05 states that " where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation" quoting *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). The combination of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast et al. B teach that the stability of formoterol fumarate may be improved by drying the powder prior to mixing it with the other ingredients of an anti-asthmatic aerosol composition. Thus, although the water content is not disclosed, it is not inventive to discover a workable range for the water content discernable by routine experimentation.

Regarding claim 9, Clarke et al. teach that the fluticasone propionate is present at 0.250% by weight of the composition (para. 0024).

Regarding claim 10, Clarke et al. teach that the formoterol fumarate dihydrate is present at 0.012% by weight of the composition (para. 0024).

Regarding claims 13-15 and 32, Clarke et al. teach that the aerosol composition comprises HFA 134a and HFA 227, both hydrofluoroalkanes (para. 0024).

Regarding claim 16, the propellants (HFA 134a and HFA 227) are present at 97.238% by weight of the composition (para. 0024).

Regarding claim 21, Clarke et al. teach that the inhalation device may be an aerosol vial (para. 0015).

Regarding claim 23, Clarke et al. teach that the metered dose inhaler may deliver 6 to 24 micrograms of formoterol fumarate dihydrate (para. 0017). MPEP 2144.05 states that “[i]n the case where the claimed ranges ‘overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art’ a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists” quoting *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). In the instant case, the claimed range overlaps the range taught by Clarke et al. and is therefore *prima facie* obvious.

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Clarke et al. teach that the metered dose inhaler may deliver from 25 to 500 micrograms of fluticasone propionate dihydrate (para. 0017). MPEP 2144.05 states that “[i]n the case where the claimed ranges ‘overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art’ a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists” quoting *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). In the instant case, the claimed range overlaps the range taught by Clarke et al. and is therefore *prima facie* obvious.

Regarding claim 27, Clarke et al. teach that the aerosol vial may be a metered dose inhaler (para. 0015).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Clarke et al. with those of Trofast et al. and Trofast. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because Trofast teaches that formoterol fumarate dihydrate is unstable when combined

with a reactive species such as lactose monohydrate, Trofast et al. teach a method of drying anti-asthmatic substances to stabilize them for longer shelf life, and Clarke et al. teach combining formoterol fumarate dihydrate with lactose monohydrate for use as an anti-asthmatic medication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 26, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has submitted an affidavit and argues that the Clarke and Trofast references would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the water content of formoterol fumarate dihydrate to improve stability.

First, with regard to the affidavit submitted February 26, 2010, the results of table 1 are not persuasive for several reasons. Claim 1 claims a water content of **about 4.8** to 4.28% by weight. "About" is not defined anywhere in the specification and in fact, is reasonably construed to include values both below about above 4.8 and 4.28%, including 4.1%, a value reported as sample #4-1 to show a mix of an anhydrous and dihydrate. The results do not show the upper limit of water content or its effect on the dihydrate species. Additionally, claim 1 uses the open language of "comprising" for the formoterol fumarate dihydrate, thus leaving the possibility of a mixture of anhydrous and dihydrate. Claim 1 does not claim a "stable" or "stabilized" composition, thus further evidencing that the formoterol fumarate must all be in the dihydrate form. Finally, claim 1 does not claim any type of timeline for how long the stability must be maintained. For these reasons, the affidavit, including table 1, does not differentiate the instant claims from the prior art.

Second, with regard to applicant's arguments that the Trofast references would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the water content, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The Trofast references teach that formoterol fumarate dihydrate in the presence of lactose, should be dried to stabilize the formoterol fumarate dihydrate. Thus, the Trofast references implicitly teach that water content influences stability, as the lactose is in an aqueous solution. Excipients with water species influence formoterol fumarate dihydrate stability and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to manipulate the water content of formoterol fumarate dihydrate.

The remaining rejections are identical to those of the previous office action but are newly presented because of the incorporation of claim 2 into independent claim 1. Because the examiner has not found Applicant's arguments persuasive, the below rejections are repeated.

12. Claims 3-6, 17, 21-22, 26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) read in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110) and Trofast (WO 01/89491) as applied to claims 1, 7-10, 13-16, 21, 23-25, 27-28 and 32 above, and further in view of Kordikowski et al. (US 2003/0223939).

The combination of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast teaches each limitation of claim 1. However, these references fail to teach the fine particle fraction of the delivered dose of formoterol fumarate dihydrate or steroid. Kordikowski et al. cure this deficiency.

Regarding claims 3 and 5, Kordikowski et al. teach particulate suspensions comprising active substances in particulate form suspended in hydrofluoroalkane propellants for use in metered dose inhalers (abstract). Kordikowski et al. specifically teach that fluticasone propionate in HFA 134a (Figure 5) and formoterol fumarate dihydrate (para. 0096) have a fine particle fraction of 35% (para. 0020). These suspensions are stored at 75% relative humidity and at 40°C (para. 0095) for varying periods of time, include 6 months (para. 0080). The fluid suspensions allow the aerosol formulations used in metered dose inhalers to give a more uniform dosing rate throughout the useable life of the inhaler (para. 0081). The relative standard deviation in the quantity of active substance delivered in each dose is no more than 15% (para. 0084). MPEP 2144.05 states that “[i]n the case where the claimed ranges ‘overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art’ a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists” quoting *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). This “no more than 15%” parameter disclosed by Kordikowski et al. fits within the variance of +/- 25% and the claimed range is therefore *prima facie* obvious.

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Kordikowski et al. teach particulate suspensions comprising active substances in particulate form suspended in hydrofluoroalkane propellants for use in metered dose inhalers (abstract). Kordikowski et al. specifically teach that fluticasone propionate in HFA 134a (Figure 5) and formoterol fumarate dihydrate (para. 0096) have a fine particle fraction of 35% (para. 0020). This fine particle fraction is delivered through a metered dose inhaler (para. 0021).

Regarding claim 17, Kordikowski et al. teach that ethanol is present at less than 0.01% based on the weight of the fluid vehicle (para. 0131).

Regarding claims 21-22 and 33, Kordikowski et al. teach that the aluminum metered dose inhaler need not be coated (paras. 0139-0141).

Regarding claim 26, Kordikowski et al. teach that the relative standard deviation in the quantity of active substance delivered in each dose is preferably no more than 15% (para. 0084). Although Kordikowski et al. does not specifically state that this active substance dosage is stated on the label, it is well known in the art that inhaler labels specify the quantity of active substance delivered in each dose.

It would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast with those of Kordikowski et al. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because the Kordikowski et al. teach the desired fine particle fraction for an inhaler and the maximum standard deviation between the intended and actual active substance dosage. Additionally, Kordikowski et al. teach a method of improving flocculation behavior such that less ethanol than usual is required as a co-solvent and such that the aluminum metered dose inhaler need not be coated, simplifying the manufacturing process for an aerosol metered dose inhaler composition.

13. Claims 11-12, 18-19 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke et al. (US 2002/0103260) read in view of Trofast et al. (WO 92/18110) and Trofast (WO 01/89491) as applied to claims 1, 7-10, 13-16, 21, 23-25, 27-28 and 32 above, and further in view of Keller et al. (US 6,475,467).

The combination of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast teaches each limitation of claims 1 and 13. However, these references fail to teach that salts of cromoglycic acid and or nedocromil may be used in the formoterol fumarate dihydrate composition. Additionally, these references fail to teach that fluorochlorocarbons such as F218 may be used as the propellant. Keller et al. cure these deficiencies.

Regarding claim 11, Keller et al. teach the use of pharmaceutically acceptable salts of cromoglycic acid or nedocromil as carriers in an aerosol suspension formulation (abstract). The active compound in the formulation may be formoterol (column 5, line23).

Regarding claim 12, Keller et al. teach that the cromoglycic acid salts or nedocromil salts are present at not over approximately 0.7%, preferably present at 0.007 to 0.36%, and particularly present at 0.015 to 0.15% by weight of the total formulation (column 6, lines 50-56). MPEP 2144.05 states that "[i]n the case where the claimed ranges 'overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art' a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists" quoting *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). In the instant case, the claimed range overlaps the ranges disclosed by the prior art and is therefore *prima facie* obvious.

Regarding claim 18, Keller et al. teach that the aerosol formulations may contain surface-active agents such as oleic acid, lecithin, sorbitan trioleate, cetylpyridinium chloride, benzalkonium chloride, polyoxyethylene (20) sorbitan monolaurate, polyoxyethylene (20) sorbitan monostearate, polyoxyethylene (20) sorbitan monooleate, polyoxypropylene/polyoxyethylene block copolymers,

polyoxypropylene/polyoxyethylene/ethylenediamine block copolymers, ethoxylated castor oil and the like (column 9, lines 17-25).

Regarding claim 19, Keller et al. teach that the proportion of surface-active agents, if present, can preferably be approximately 0.0001 to 1% by weight of the formulation (column 9, lines 25-27).

Regarding claims 29-31, Keller et al. teach that suitable non-toxic liquid propellants for aerosol formulations include trichloro-monofluoromethane (F11), dichlorodifluoromethane (F12), monochlorotrifluoromethane (F13), dichloro-monofluoromethane (F21), monochlorodifluoromethane (F22), monochloromonofluoromethane (F31), 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (F113), 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (F114), 1-chloro-1,1,2,2,2-pentafluoroethane (F115), 2,2-dichloro-1,1,1-trifluoroethane (F123), 1,2-dichloro-1,1,2-trifluoroethane (F123a), 2-chloro-1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (F124), 2-chloro-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane (F124a), 1,2-dichloro-1,1-difluoroethane (F132b), 1-chloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane (F133), 2-chloro-1,1,1-trifluoroethane (F133a), 1,1-dichloro-1-fluoroethane (F141b) and 1-chloro-1,1-difluoroethane (F142b), alkanes such as *propane* (with regard to instant claim 30), butane and isobutane, fluorinated alkanes such as *octafluoropropane* (F218) (with regard to instant claim 31)(column 7, lines 7-25).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast with those of Keller et al. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so with regard to claims 11-12 because Keller et al. teach that disodium

cromoglycate and nedocromil sodium are used in known metered-dose aerosols in a therapeutically or prophylactically efficacious amount. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Keller et al. with those of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast with regard to claims 18-19 because Keller et al. teach that the aerosol formulations may comprise a surfactant to lower the surface tension of the formulation. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Keller et al. with those of Clarke et al., Trofast et al. and Trofast with regard to claims 29-31 because Keller et al. teach the simple substitution of known propellants.

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicoletta Kennedy whose telephone number is

(571)270-1343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:15 to 6:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Gollamudi Landau can be reached on 571-272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 1611

/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611